

REMARKS

Claims 21 and 39

Claims 21 and 39 are independent claim, and have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai (6,587,861). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to these claims. Applicant provides six separate reasons why Wakai does not anticipate claims 21 and 39.

First reason why claims 21 and 39 are not anticipated by Wakai

As to the claims 21 and 39 prior to the amendments made herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is improperly interpreting Wakai in rejecting claims 21 and 39. These claims are directed to displaying a print window. The Examiner has stated that FIG. 61 and column 35, lines 15-32 discloses displaying a print window, where FIG. 106 is the print window. (See final office action, pp. 2-3.)

However, column 35, lines 15-32 of Wakai state the following:

FIG. 61 is a flowchart showing the processing for changing the print setup for a selected job. In FIG. 61 the state shifting and the processing sequence are shown when the original action type of a selected job is "Print".

At step S6101 a print setup change menu is displayed. FIG. 119 is a diagram showing an example print setup change menu. At step S6102 a process corresponding to a selected job is designated. When "Print Now Also" is selected, at step S6104, in addition to the selected job, a job is added for which the print time for the selected job is used as the current time. When "Print Now" is selected, the print time for the selected job is changed to the current time. Therefore, in these cases, the printing is performed at the current time. When "Schedule" is selected, at step S6106 the schedule change menu in FIG. 116 is displayed. At step S6107 the print schedule is changed by using the menu. In either case, at step S6108 the screen is returned to the display for the job list that was explained in FIG. 56.

Column 35, lines 15-32 of Wakai do not discuss FIG. 106 at all. Therefore, the Examiner cannot interpret Wakai as displaying the print window of FIG. 106 in column 15, lines 15-32 and FIG. 61

thereof, because Wakai does not discuss in this excerpt the print window of FIG. 106 at all. To this end, the Examiner has not provided a proper *prima facie* case of anticipation, insofar as his interpretation of Wakai vis-à-vis the claimed invention does not make any sense.

Second reason why claims 21 and 39 are not anticipated by Wakai

As to the claims 21 and 39 prior to the amendments made herein, Applicant also respectfully submits that Wakai does not disclose “in response to a user selecting a button on the print window, displaying a job schedule window.” As noted above, the Examiner has indicated that FIG. 106 of Wakai shows a print window and that FIG. 109 of Wakai shows a job schedule window. First, the Examiner has stated that a user selects a button on the print window in Wakai by “selecting a job from the print queue.” (Final office action, p. 2) However, there are no “buttons” in FIG. 6. A user does not “select a button on the print window” in Wakai to bring up the job schedule window, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Rather, the user at best seems to check a box to the left of a job within the print queue in FIG. 109. Checking a box is not the same as selecting a button, however, such that Wakai does not anticipate the invention.

Third reason why claims 21 and 39 are not anticipated by Wakai

As to the claims 21 and 39 prior to the amendments made herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is improperly interpreting Wakai in claims 21 and 39 in another manner as well. Specifically, as to the claim limitation that “in response to a user selecting a button on the print window, displaying a job schedule window,” the Examiner has indicated that FIG. 106 of Wakai shows a print window such that in response to a user selecting a button on this window, the job schedule window of FIG. 109 is displayed. However, this is not what Wakai actually discloses.

Rather, Wakai states the following in relation to the job schedule window of FIG. 109.

[A]t step S5313 a password input screen (FIG. 108) is displayed. A password is input, and when it matches the password assigned for the selected job, a process

setup screen (FIG. 109) is displayed for the job in the print queue that was selected.

(Col. 31, ll. 45-50.) Thus, in Wakai, the job schedule window of FIG. 109 is display *in response to the user entering in the proper password in the password input window of FIG. 108 – and not in response to the user selecting a button in the print window of FIG. 106*, as claimed by the Examiner. Therefore, the Examiner cannot interpret Wakai as displaying the job schedule window of FIG. 109 in response to a user selecting a button in the print window of FIG. 106, where Wakai discloses no such thing, and in fact discloses something completely different. To this end, the Examiner has not provided a proper *prima facie* case of anticipation, insofar as his interpretation of Wakai vis-à-vis the claimed invention does not make any sense.

Fourth reason why claims 21 and 39 are not anticipated by Wakai

As to the claims 21 and 39 after amendment thereof in the present office action response, these claims are limited to the information to be printed on a printing device specifically being “related to just one print job,” where the print window that is display to permit the user to modify printing parameters further is “related to just the one print job.” See, for instance, page 9 of the patent application as filed, which describes that “FIG. 5 is a block diagram depicting a non-limiting example of a print control screen 500 that can be used to control printing parameters of a print job 318 (FIG. 3),” where “a” print job is thus just one print job. Likewise, see pages 4 and 5 of the patent application as filed, which describe “the SS 103 receives user input designing a date and/or time for printing a print job,” where again “a” print job is just one print job.

By comparison, the print window in FIG. 106 of Wakai, as identified by the Examiner, does not relate to *just one* print job, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. Rather, as depicted in FIG. 106 of Wakai, this print window relates to *more than one* print job, at least insofar as there are *two* print jobs depicted in FIG. 106. For at least this reason as well, then, Wakai does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Fifth reason why claims 21 and 39 are not anticipated by Wakai

As to the claims 21 and 39 after amendment thereof in the present office action response, these claims are further limited to “the user [being] permitted to modify the printing parameters *directly on the print window* without any other window having to be displayed.” For example, in FIG. 5 of the patent application as filed, which shows an example of a print window 500, the user is able to “directly on the print window” modify the page range and copies printing parameter. That is, no other window has to be displayed for these print parameters to be modified.

By comparison, in the print window of FIG. 106 of Wakai, the user is not able to *directly on the print window* modify any printing parameters, without any other window having to be displayed. In particular, as is depicted in FIG. 106 of Wakai, there are no actual printing parameters that the user can directly modify on this print window, in contradistinction to the claimed invention. At best, another window would have to be displayed in Wakai for the user to modify printing parameters, also in contradistinction to the claimed invention. For at least this reason as well, Wakai does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Sixth reason why claims 21 and 39 are not anticipated by Wakai

As to the claims 21 and 39 after amendment thereof in the present office action response, these claims are also limited to “the job schedule window being displayed separately from the print window *such that there is no common window encompassing both the job schedule window and the print window.*” For example, as is readily apparent in FIGs. 5 and 6 of the patent application as filed, the print window of FIG. 5 is completely separate from the job schedule window of FIG. 6. As such, there is no common window that encompasses both the job schedule window and the print window.

By comparison, there is indeed a common window in Wakai that encompasses both the job schedule window of FIG. 109 and the print window of FIG. 106. Here are FIGs. 106 and 109 of Wakai, in annotated form:

FIG. 106

COMMON WINDOW

PRINT WINDOW

Device Back Forward End

Home Device SSQA161 New Interaction Help

Public Info Print URL Goto Device

Status of Print Queue

<input type="checkbox"/>	Feasibility Report.doc	jc@canon
<input type="checkbox"/>	Canon Range of Printers.doc	jc@canon

POWER SAVER ON

FIG. 109

(COMMON WINDOW)

(JOB schedule window)

Device				Back		Forward		End	
Home Device SSQA161						Help		Quit	
Print Queue Job									
Feasibility Report.doc				jc@canon					
What would you like to do ?									
Print Later		<input type="checkbox"/>	After 1 Hour		<input type="checkbox"/>	09/18/1997		22:01	<input type="radio"/>
Hold Here		<input type="checkbox"/>	For 1 Hour		<input type="checkbox"/>	09/18/1997		22:01	<input type="radio"/>
Cancel Printing			Pause/Restart			Go Back			

☐ POWER SAVER ON

In these figures of Wakai, you can readily see that there is a common window that encompasses both the print window and the job schedule window. Thus, when you go from the print window of FIG. 106 to the job schedule window of FIG. 109, the common window that encompasses the print window stays the same, and all that changes is that the print window is replaced within the common window by the job schedule window. Therefore, in contradistinction to the claimed invention, Wakai does not display its job schedule window separately from the print window

“such that there is no common window encompassing both the job schedule window and the print window.” For this reason as well, Wakai does not anticipate claims 26 and 39.

Claim 22

Claim 22 is a dependent claim depending from claim 21, and has also been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai. Claim 21 is limited to the user modifying one or more printing parameters controlling printing of the information on the printing device, where these printing parameters are modified directly on the print window without any other window having to be displayed. Claim 22 further limits these printing parameters to include a number of copies of the print job in question, and a page range of the print job in question.

Applicant submits that claim 22 is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base claim, claim 21, but also because it is independently patentable, irrespective of the patentability of base claim 21. The Examiner has relied upon column 13, lines 50-55 of Wakai, as disclosing the modification of printing parameters. First, however, this part of Wakai just discloses at best the number of copies of the print job in question (i.e., “Object Count (the number of copies of the object)”), but it does not disclose a page range of the print job in question, to which claim 22 is also limited. For just this reason, Wakai cannot anticipate claim 22.

Second, it is noted that claim 22 further limits claim 21. As such, the printing parameters recited in claim 21 – the number of copies of the print job and the page range of the print job – are the printing parameters that are directly modified on the print window. However, the print window of FIG. 106 of Wakai, where the Examiner has stated that FIG. 106 shows the print window of the claimed invention, does not in fact permit direct modification of these parameters specifically recited in claim 22. For this reason as well, Wakai cannot anticipate claim 22.

Claims 23, 26-27, 29, and 40-41

Claims 23, 26-27, 29, and 40-41 are dependent claims depending from claims 21 and 39. These claims have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai, but are patentable, however, at least because they depend from patentable base claims.

Claim 24

Claim 24 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 21, and has been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai. Claim 24 is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base independent claim. Applicant also submits that claim 24 is independently patentable, irrespective of the patentability of claim 21.

Claim 24 is limited to the user requesting, via the user interface, to print the information on the printing device, specifically “by selecting a print menu item within a file menu of the user interface.” Applicant has further amended claim 24 such that “the file menu [is] labeled with a label entitled ‘file.’” (See, e.g., patent application as filed, FIG. 4, where the menu 402 is specifically labeled “file.”)

The Examiner has indicated that FIG. 121 of Wakai shows the limitations of claim 24. However, in FIG. 121 of Wakai, the file menu is not specifically labeled within a label entitled “file.” Therefore, claim 24 as amended is not anticipated by Wakai.

Claim 25

Claim 25 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 21, and has been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai. Claim 25 is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base independent claim. Applicant also submits that claim 25 is independently patentable, irrespective of the patentability of claim 21.

Claim 25 is limited to the user selecting the button on the print window “by selecting a properties button.” Applicant has further amended claim 25 such that “the properties button [is]

labeled with a label entitled 'properties.'" (See, e.g., patent application as filed, FIG. 5, where the print window 500 includes a properties button 507 labeled "properties.") Applicant provides two reasons why claim 25 is not anticipated by Wakai.

First reason why claim 25 is not anticipated by Wakai

First, the Examiner has improperly interpreted Wakai in rejection claim 25. It is noted that claim 25 depends from claim 21, such that the properties button of claim 25 is the button of the print window delineated in claim 21, which when selected causes the job schedule window to be displayed. The Examiner interpreted Wakai in relation to claim 21 such that the print window is depicted in FIG. 106 of Wakai and the job schedule window is depicted in FIG. 109 of Wakai.

Therefore, the Examiner's interpretation of Wakai in relation to claim 25 does not make any sense when compared to his interpretation of Wakai in relation to claim 21. FIG. 122 of Wakai shows a completely different window than FIG. 106 does. For Wakai to anticipate both claims 21 and 25, the Examiner has to show a single window in Wakai that is the print window of claims 21 and 25. He cannot say that the window of FIG. 106 in Wakai is the print window for purposes of claim 21 and that the window of FIG. 122 in Wakai is the print window for purposes of claim 25, because claim 25 depends from claim 21, such that the print window referred to in claim 25 is the same print window referred to in claim 21.

Furthermore, it is noted that selecting the properties button of claim 25 results in the job schedule window of claim 21 being displayed; again, claim 25 depends from claim 21, so that selection of the button that claim 21 recites as resulting in the display of the job schedule window is the button that claim 25 limits to being a properties button. Now, the Examiner has indicated that the job schedule window of claim 21 is the window in FIG. 109 of Wakai. However, nowhere in Wakai is it said that the window of FIG. 109 is displayed in response to pressing any of the buttons of the window of FIG. 122. Again, the Examiner's interpretation of Wakai in relation to claim 25 does not make any sense when compared to his interpretation of Wakai in

relation to claim 21. For at least these reasons, then, the Examiner has not provided a proper *prima facie* case of anticipation as to claim 25.

Second reason why claim 25 is not anticipated by Wakai

As has been noted, the Examiner has indicated that FIG. 122 of Wakai shows the limitations of claim 25. However, in FIG. 122 of Wakai, the properties button in question is not specifically labeled within a label entitled “properties.” Indeed, insofar as selection of *none* of the buttons of FIG. 122 results in the display of the job schedule window of FIG. 109 of Wakai, it is unclear which button the Examiner even intends to correspond to the properties button of claim 25. Therefore, claim 25 as amended is not anticipated by Wakai.

Claim 28

Claim 28 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai in view of Zhang (6,016,478). Claim 28 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 1, and therefore is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base independent claim.

Claims 30 and 36

Claims 30 and 36 are independent claims, and have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai. Applicant has amended these claims in a manner similar to which independent claims 1 and 39 have been amended. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 30 and 36 are patentable for at least some of same reasons that claims 1 and 39 are, as have been discussed above.

Claims 31, 33, 35, and 37-38

Claims 31, 33, 35, and 37-38 are dependent claims, depending from independent claims 30 and 36. These claims have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai, but are patentable, however, at least because they depend from patentable base claims.

Claim 32

Claim 32 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 30, and has been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wakai. Claim 32 is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base independent claim. Applicant also submits that claim 32 is independently patentable, irrespective of the patentability of claim 30.

Claim 32 has been amended similar to the manner in which claim 24 has been amended. Therefore, claim 32 is patentable over Wakai for at least the same reasons that claim 24 is, as have been discussed above.

Claim 34

Claim 34 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakai in view of Zhang. Claim 34 is a dependent claim, depending from claim 30, and therefore is patentable at least because it depends from a patentable base independent claim.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the pending claims in condition for allowance, and request that they so be allowed. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Mike Dryja, Applicants' Attorney, at 425-427-5094, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. For these reasons, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



September 17, 2007
Date

Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248
Gilbert, AZ 85233
tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 425-563-2098